

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, join me in voting “no,” defeating this rule, and defeating the previous question. Perhaps we can finally get to work on the people’s business here in the House of Representatives and finally fix our broken immigration system and replace it with one that works for our prosperity, our security, and for job creation for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, let me remind you why we are here today. We are here today because the President, who signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act into law in March of 2010, on July 2 of this year decided he was not going to enforce a portion of the law. Unilaterally, the President made the decision, didn’t consult with Congress, put it out in a blog post on one of their White House Web sites on July 2.

Then 3 days later, on the Friday before the Fourth of July weekend, they came out with a raft of regulations; and buried within that raft of regulations was the fact that, oh, by the way, we’re not checking anybody who comes in. We’ll rely on self-attestation.

They were required to do that because, by not enforcing the employer mandate that was in their law that they signed, by not enforcing the employer mandate, the data would not be collected and, in fact, there was no way to enforce that data.

So we simply don’t need the data. We’ll trust; people are going to be honest. If they come in and say they need a subsidy, of course they need a subsidy. We’ll give it to them. And, yeah, at some point, it might even be checked against their IRS records.

How are you going to call that back from someone who doesn’t have the money anymore because, after all, the dollars and the subsidy don’t go to the individual; they go to the insurance company. It’s not like that individual went and deposited that in a bank account. It went to their insurance company to buy their health insurance.

The money’s been spent, the policy has been utilized or not, but that water is under the bridge.

I didn’t ask for this debate. I didn’t ask for the President to sign the health care bill into law, but he did. But then I sure didn’t ask him to just delay parts of it.

If anything is inconvenient to you, Mr. President, just kind of put it away, put it to the side.

All kinds of things have fallen off the Affordable Care Act as it’s bucked and burped down the road towards implementation. You may remember the debate about preexisting conditions. What about the Federal preexisting condition program?

Anyone who showed up after February 1 of this year to be covered under the Federal preexisting condition program was told, sorry, the window is closed; we’re not signing up any more individuals because we’re out of money. So they had to wait 11 months until the Elysian Fields of the Affordable Care Act spread out before them.

But what are they to do for that 11 months if they’ve got a diagnosis which is incompatible with life unless they get treatment?

But the administration didn’t care about that. They simply suspended enrollment to the preexisting condition program.

Well, what about the caps on out-of-pocket expenses that an individual could incur during a year?

Under the Affordable Care Act there were caps signed in law by the President. Well, the caps were excluded because it’s kind of inconvenient, and we don’t want to do that anymore.

The small business health exchanges are delayed for a year. What else is going to fall off this thing as it lurches towards implementation on January 1?

I don’t know. But I do know this: we have an opportunity today to vote on a rule that allows the bill to come to the floor that will require that the Department of Health and Human Services, the Inspector General, ensure that those individuals who come and say, hey, I’m eligible for a subsidy, to ensure that they are, in fact, eligible for that subsidy.

We fight all the time in committee with money going out the door at the Department of Health and Human Services, the pay-and-chase model. It clearly doesn’t work.

Medicare and Medicaid, inappropriate payments, inefficient expenditures happen all the time. Let’s not make that worse. Let’s stop paying the crooks. We have an opportunity today to stop paying the crooks.

Mr. Speaker, today’s rule provides for the consideration of a critical bill to protect taxpayer dollars from the rampant fraud inevitable in an undertaking as massive as the health insurance overhaul that is known as ObamaCare.

I congratulate my colleague from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for her thoughtful piece of legislation. And for that reason, I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 2 o’clock and 10 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 339; adoption of H. Res. 339, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2775, NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 339) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Carter	Fleischmann
Alexander	Cassidy	Fleming
Amash	Chabot	Flores
Amodei	Chaffetz	Forbes
Bachmann	Coble	Fortenberry
Bachus	Coffman	Fox
Barletta	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Barr	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Collins (NY)	Gardner
Benishek	Conaway	Garrett
Bentivolio	Cook	Gerlach
Bilirakis	Cotton	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Gibson
Black	Crawford	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Boustany	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Daines	Gosar
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Granger
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Broun (GA)	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Bucshon	Duffy	Griffith (VA)
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Guthrie
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Hall
Camp	Ellmers	Hanna
Campbell	Farenthold	Harper
Cantor	Fincher	Harris
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Hartzler